

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated March 29, 2000, having a shortened statutory period of response ending on June 29, 2000. This amendment requests changes to Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-21; however, all of those changes are of a grammatical or stylistic nature. None of those changes substantially modifies the scope of the corresponding claims.

In Claim 1, for example, the preamble is changed to refer to a method for "supporting" increased compactness, rather than a method for increasing compactness. Also, the phrase "within said display screen" is removed from the fourth paragraph as being redundant, in light of the second paragraph. Stylistic changes are also made to the fourth paragraph (for instance, "wherein" is replaced with "such that"). In addition, the original Claim 1 recited "simultaneously" displaying data, but Claim 1 explicitly recites only a single data display operation. This amendment therefore removes "simultaneously" from Claim 1. Also, Claim 1 originally included two "wherein" clauses reciting that data obtained at the touch-sensitive input area may be displayed in the display area. Since those clauses were cumulative, one of them has been removed. The amendments to the other claims are of a similar nature.

In addition, this amendment requests entry of 15 new claims (*i.e.*, Claims 25-39) that are directed to electronic systems without regard to whether those system are portable or not. However, this amendment does not introduce any new matter.

With regard to the claim numbers, the Office Action explains that Claims 1-21 were renumbered by the examiner to 1-22. As filed, however, the application had 24 claims, numbered 1-12, 12-22, and 21 (with the numbers 12 and 21 being mistakenly utilized twice). Applicants understand

the Office Action to be saying that Claims 12 (second occurrence) through 21 (first occurrence) have been renumbered to 13-22. The original Claims 21 (first and second occurrence) and 22 were apparently not examined. Those claims are also being canceled (without prejudice) by this amendment. Accordingly, only Claims 1-21, as renumbered by the examiner (*i.e.*, Claims 1-12, 12-20 as originally filed), remain in the case.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent no. 5,581,243 issued to Ouelette et al. (hereinafter *Ouelette*) in light of U.S. Patent no. 5,748,185 issued to Stephan et al. (hereinafter *Stephan*). Those rejections are respectfully traversed.

As described in the specification and the pending claims, the present invention relates to a method, a system, and a program product that supports increased portable computer compactness by providing a dynamic input pad or keyboard. That is, the present invention relates to a "touch-sensitive pad" that is automatically displayed within "a touch-sensitive input area" of the computer's display screen "in response to detecting [that] a user's hands [are] positioned at said touch-sensitive area" (Claim 1).

Ouelette and *Stephan* also relate to touch screen displays. Specifically, *Ouelette* describes a simulated keyboard that is displayed on a touch-sensitive display (column 2, line 62 - column 3, line 5). Unlike *Ouelette*, *Stephan* relates to an input device for controlling operations such as cursor movement, with the device being described primarily as a stand-alone device that is connected to the computer by a cable (column 5, lines 10-14). However, *Stephan* does briefly mention an alternative embodiment in which part of a touch-sensitive display is utilized to control cursor movement (column 12, lines 25-43). Applicants can find nothing in *Ouelette* or *Stephan*, however, that teaches or suggests that a simulated keyboard might be displayed in response to detecting that a user's hands are

positioned at a touch-sensitive area of the display. Instead, a user must explicitly request the keyboard in *Ouelette* by pressing a "SIMULATED KEYBOARD ON/OFF button" or a "PHANTOM KEYBOARD ON toggle button" (column 6, lines 7-28; column 7, lines 17-38). Further, *Stephan*, says nothing about what might cause the cursor control region to be displayed, apparently contemplating that display of the cursor control region is mandatory and permanent.

The Office Action explicitly recognizes that *Ouelette* does not disclose graphically displaying a touch-sensitive pad in response to detecting a user's hands at the touch sensitive area. The Office Actions asserts, however, that this feature is disclosed *Stephan*, citing column 5, lines 10-62; column 11, lines 28-67; and column 12, lines 1-67). Lines 10-62 of column 5 relate to a stand-alone touchpad that allows a user to control movement of a cursor in the computer's display. Lines 28-67 of column 11 relate to an alternative embodiment in which the device includes "three touchpad members" instead of just one (line 32) and another alternative embodiment in which the device includes "pan control regions" (which can be used like scroll bars to shift the currently displayed portion of a document), as well as cursor control regions (line 53). Lines 1-67 of column 12 relate to additional alternative embodiments. However, Applicants can find nothing in the lines cited by the Office Action that teaches or suggests displaying a keypad "in response to detecting a user's hands positioned at [a] touch-sensitive area [of a display]" (Claim 1).

Thus, even if combined, *Ouelette* and *Stephan* do not to disclose or suggests all of the features of the present invention that are recited in Claim 1. Consequently, even if *Ouelette* and *Stephan* were to be combined, the combination would not make out a prima facie case of obviousness for the invention described in Claim 1. Furthermore, Claims 8 and 15 recite features that are the same as or similar to the features of Claim 1 described above, and Claims 8 and 15 are therefore also believed to patentably define the

invention over the prior art of record. In addition, the remainder of the claims depend from Claim 1, 8, or 15 and therefore include all of the features of their respective parent claims. The dependent claims are therefore also believed to be allowable. Furthermore, some or all of the dependent claims recite additional features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art of record. For example, Claim 2 recites "concealing said touch-sensitive pad from view, in response to detecting that said user's hands are no longer positioned at said touch-sensitive input area." For all of the above reasons, reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1-21 is respectfully requested.

Further, the claims added by this amendment also describe the dynamic operation of the virtual keyboard of the present invention. Those claims are therefore also believed to patentably define the invention over the prior art of record.

Applicants have diligently responded to the Office Action by canceling or amending many of the original claims, adding new claims, and pointing out with particularity how the pending claims patentably define the invention over the prior art of record. A Notice of Allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested.

No extension of time is believed to be required in submitting this response. However, if an extension is required, please consider that extension requested, and charge the corresponding fee to **IBM Corporation's Deposit Account No. 09-0447**. In addition, please charge the fee of \$504.00 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 for three independent claims in excess of three and fifteen claims in excess of the claims of the 21 already paid for, as well as any other fees necessary to further the prosecution of this application, to **IBM Corporation's Deposit Account No. 09-0447**.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael R. Barré

Registration No. 44,023

For FELSMAN, BRADLEY, VADEN,
GUNTER & DILLON, LLP

Suite 350, Lakewood on the Park
7600B North Capital of Texas Highway
Austin, Texas 78731
512-343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)